

REMARKS

The Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough consideration given the present application. Claims 1, 5-9, and 13-23 are pending. Claims 2-4 and 10-12 were previously cancelled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the subject matter set forth therein. Claims 1, 6, 9, 14, 17-19, and 23 are amended. Claims 1 and 9 are independent. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 5-9, and 13-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(a) as being anticipated by ADAMS/Car 2000, and claims 1, 5-9, and 13-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by ADAMS/Car November 1997 (Esch). These rejections are respectfully traversed.

While not conceding the appropriateness of the Examiner's rejection, but merely to advance prosecution of the instant application, independent claim 1 is amended to recite a combination of steps directed to a method of assisting in the design of a vehicular suspension, including *inter alia*

entering the specification values corresponding to the predetermined definition points of the indicated suspension in any one of said specification value entering window, said first analytic window, or said second analytic window; and

reflecting the specification values associated with the predetermined definition points that have been entered in one of the windows so that the specification values are associated with the predetermined definition points in each of the two other windows.

In addition, independent claim 9 is amended to recite a combination of elements directed to an apparatus for assisting in the design of a vehicular suspension, including *inter alia*

means for entering specification values corresponding to the predetermined definition points of the indicated suspension in any one of said specification value entering window, said first analytic window, or said second analytic window; and

means for reflecting the specification values associated with the predetermined reference points that have been entered in the one of the windows so that the specification values are associated with the predetermined definition points in each of the two other windows.

In other words, the present invention teaches three different input windows, each of which displays fields for entering specification values associated with multiple predetermined reference points (A, B, C, etc.). Further, entry of the specification values associated with the predetermined reference points into any one of these three windows causes the specification values associated with each of the predetermined reference points also to be reflected and shown in each of the other two windows. ADAMS/Car 2000 and ADAMS/Car November 1997 (Esch) both fail to teach or suggest this.

Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of steps/elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 9 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record, including ADAMS/Car 2000 and ADAMS/Car November 1997 (Esch).

In contrast to the present invention, while ADAMS/Car 2000 and ADAMS/Car November 1997 (Esch) makes mention of hard points, there is no indication that data can be entered into any of three windows. Neither of these documents teaches or suggests entering the specification values corresponding to the predetermined definition points of the indicated suspension in any one of said specification value entering window, said first analytic window, or said second analytic window, as presently claimed. Further, neither of these documents teaches or suggests reflecting the specification values associated with the predetermined definition points that have been entered in one of the windows so that the specification values are associated with the predetermined definition points as shown in each of the two other windows, as presently claimed.

Thus, at least for the reasons stated above, the Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of steps/elements as set forth in each of independent claims 1 and 9 is not disclosed or made obvious by the prior art of record.

Therefore, independent claims 1 and 9 are in condition for allowance.

The Examiner will note that claims 6 and 14 have been amended to set forth additional novel features of the present invention, and dependent claims 17-19 and 23 have been amended merely to place them in better form.

All dependent claims are in condition for allowance due to their dependency from allowable independent claims, or due to the additional novel features set forth therein.

Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Since the remaining patents cited by the Examiner have not been utilized to reject claims, but merely to show the state of the art, no comment need be made with respect thereto.


All of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and that the present application is in condition for allowance.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, he is invited to telephone Carl T. Thomsen (Reg. No. 50,786) at (703) 205-8000.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§1.16 or 1.17, particularly extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By 

Paul C. Lewis, #43,368

P. O. Box 747

Falls Church, VA 22040-0747

(703) 205-8000


PCL:CTT/ags/bsh